

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

DAVID HUNT,

Plaintiff,

vs.

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL
SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,

Defendant.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

Case No. 5:17-cv-2089

OPINION & ORDER
[Resolving Doc. [15](#)]

JAMES S. GWIN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE:

In this case, Plaintiff David Hunt challenges the Social Security Administration's ("SSA") denial of his application for disability benefits.¹

Hunt alleges that, since at least February 2013, he has suffered from a variety of psychological ailments, including bipolar disorder, post-traumatic stress disorder, anxiety, and major depressive disorder.²

Accordingly, in September 2014, Plaintiff Hunt applied for social security disability benefits.³ However, SSA denied Plaintiff's application and his subsequent request for reconsideration.⁴ After an October 2016 hearing, an Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") also concluded that Plaintiff was not disabled.⁵ The SSA Appeals Council declined to review the ALJ's decision.⁶

¹ Doc. [1](#).

² Doc. [13](#) at 3–8.

³ Doc. [10](#) at 166–67.

⁴ *Id.* at 90–106.

⁵ *Id.* at 11–26.

⁶ *Id.* at 5–10.

Plaintiff now asks the Court to reverse the ALJ's denial of benefits.⁷ Magistrate Judge Burke issued a Report and Recommendation, recommending that the Court affirm the ALJ's decision.⁸ Neither party objected to that recommendation.

If a party had objected to the Report and Recommendation, the Court would consider the objected-to findings and conclusions *de novo*.⁹ However, because neither party has objected, they have waived the Court's review.¹⁰ Moreover, the Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge's conclusions.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation and **AFFIRMS** the ALJ's decision.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 22, 2019

s/ James S. Gwin
JAMES S. GWIN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

⁷ Doc. 1.

⁸ Doc. 15.

⁹ 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

¹⁰ *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149–50 (1985) (holding that Congress did not intend to “require district court review of a magistrate judge’s factual or legal conclusions . . . when neither party objects to those findings.”).